

City of San Jose

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of Task Force Meeting #18 on June 14, 2004

151 West Mission St. (Room 202 a and b)

Task Force Members Present:

Mayor Ron Gonzales (co-chair), Councilmember Forrest Williams (co-chair), Councilmember Pat Dando, Supervisor Don Gage, Christopher Platten, Chuck Butters, Craige Edgerton, Doreen Morgan, Eric Carruthers, Gladwyn D'Sousa, Helen Chapman, Jim Cunneen, Neil Struthers, Russ Danielson, Steve Schott Jr., Steve Speno, and Terry Watt.

Task Force Members Absent:

Dan Hancock, Ken Saso and Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:

Steve Kinsella (Gavilan College), David Bischoff (City of Morgan Hill), Kyle Simpson (Greenbelt Alliance), Pat Sausedo (NAIOP), Mike Griffis (County Roads), Beverly Bryant (HBANC), Carolyn McKennan (MHUSD) and Jane Mark (County Parks).

City and other Public Agencies Staff Present:

Councilmember Linda LeZotte, Joe Guerra (Mayor's Office), Jennifer Malutta (Mayor's Office), Emily Moody (District 2), Denelle Fedor (District 10), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Rebecca Flores (Housing), Randolph Shipes (ESD) and Mary Tucker (ESD).

Consultants:

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jack Hsu (Dahlin Group), Padru Kang (Dahlin Group), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies), Jim Thompson (HMH) and Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers & Associates).

Community Members Present:

Sean Morley, Dennis Kennedy, Kerry Williams, Yoon Lee, Shelli Thomas, Paul Correa, George Thomas, Jim Goodell, Jill Costa, Dennis King, Colin Tanner, Gi Petri, George Ho, Monita Ho, Tedd Faraone, Joan Doss, George Panos, Jim Evans, Rich DeLaRosa, Lee Lester, Joe Jil, Don Weden, Eric Rosenblum, Lori Williams, Sarah Muller, Rob Oneto, Libby Lucas, Tim Steele, Sean Rose, Jack Faraonz, Wayne O'Connell, Gerald Weshan, Michelle DiChene, Randy Singles, George Reilly, Crisand Giles, Vic LoBue, Lowell Tan, Richard DeSmet, Gail DeSmet, Joe Mueller, Art Gonzales, Rachel Gibson, Richard Barberi, Dawn Cameron, Charlie Payne and Virginia Holtz.

1. Welcome:

The meeting convened at 5:00 p.m. with Mayor Ron Gonzales welcoming everyone in attendance to the 19th Coyote valley Specific Plan Task Force meeting.

2. Acceptance of May 15, 2004 Task Force and Community Workshop Summary:

Co-Chair Forest Williams called for a motion to accept the meeting summary for the May 15, 2004 Community Workshop, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Acceptance of the May 17, 2004 Task Force Meeting Summary:

Co-Chair Forest Williams called for a motion to accept the meeting summary for the May 17, 2004 meeting, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Highlights from the June 12 Workshop and Discussion of Additional Direction to the Design Team Regarding the Three Alternative Design

Concepts:

Eileen Goodwin, with APEX Strategies, began by stating that she recognized many people in attendance that had also attended the June 12, 2004 workshop, and she briefly summarized the highlights of the workshop. She indicated that over 130 community members had joined the Task Force to provide input to City Staff and the consultant team on three conceptual design alternatives for Coyote Valley at the workshop.

Eileen indicated that the June 12th workshop offered people an opportunity to participate in highly interactive “hands-on” exercises on the Plan. She explained that the Dahlin Group and KenKay Associates presented three different variations of the key “urban form” elements for the plan highlighting differences in the environmental footprint, transit system, and parkway system design.

She explained that participants attended three 40-minute studio exercises in which they were asked to: 1) provide comments on the three conceptual alternatives, 2) select photos depicting their vision of specific areas of the plan and 3) participate in a block exercise to create a model for the Core area, a transit-oriented neighborhood and a transit-oriented workplace.

Eileen introduced Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the City Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, who briefly summarized the background and the planning process for the Coyote Valley Specific plan highlighting the major planning milestones to be accomplished over the next few weeks. Laurel introduced KenKay of KenKay Associates who used a PowerPoint presentation to explain the findings of the baseline environmental analysis prepared by the Group I Consultants and the highlights of the previous community workshops. Ken illustrated a series of urban design strategies that will form the building blocks of the three conceptual design alternatives for the Coyote Valley.

Doug Dahlin of Dahlin Group, presented the major components of the design alternatives, highlighting the variations of the environmental footprint, transit system and parkway system in Coyote Valley. The alternatives evolved around three transit alignments as follows:

1) Alternative I: The “Spoke Alternative” includes:

- A large open green space as a focal point for the town center (at Bailey Avenue and Santa Teresa Blvd.).
- A transit system in the shape of a “spoke”.
- Preservation of the Fisher Creek Corridor in its current alignment with setbacks for development and the introduction of a new reach of Fisher Creek to the west, along the foothills (for flood control, environmental restoration and habitat enhancement).
- A parkway system extending into Coyote Valley from two freeway interchanges on either side of the Bailey/Highway 101 interchange under construction, providing access around the periphery of the Plan area.

2) Alternative II: The “Loop Alternative” includes:

- A lake as the focal point of the town center (at Bailey Avenue and Santa Teresa Blvd.)
- A transit system in the shape of a “loop” around the town center.
- Enhancement of the Fisher Creek corridor and the provision of a second reach to the Creek extending westerly along the base of the west foothills.
- A peripheral parkway system in a slightly different configuration than in the Spoke Alternative.

3) Alternative III: The “Spine Alternative” includes:

- A lake as the focal point of the town center.
- A transit system in the shape of a “spine”.
- Realignment of Fisher Creek corridor to its historic location along the base of the westerly foothills and provision of other water features and greenways for detention, bio-filtration and recreation.
- A parkway system similar to the Spoke Alternative and Loop Alternative with a slightly different alignment extending to the north of the IBM property.

Doug Dahlin explained that the design team would consider the input from the community and the Task Force and use the screening criteria to test the three alternative design concepts over the summer. He indicated that after the screening the consultants would develop preferred concepts for the environmental footprint, transit system and the parkways system, which will provide the basis for the Preferred Design Concepts that will be considered by the Task Force in August.

Eileen introduced Paul Barber (with KenKay Associates), Roger Shanks (with Dahlin Group) and Salifu Yakubu (Principal Planner for the City Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement), who presented the highlights from the three community workshop exercises.

Paul Barber reported that the three groups of participants of the Concept Studio were asked to comment on the three design alternatives. He indicated that they were largely supportive of the lake as focal point for the core area and recommended that it be a multi-use lake with recreation and a lot of sidewalk cafés and mixed uses along the lakefront much like the canals along Riverwalk in San Antonio Texas.

He also indicated that everyone supported a transit system, multi-use parkway system and mixed-uses with higher density development in the core area. There was strong support for “connectivity” throughout the whole plan area and a recommendation for the use of an overpass over Monterey Road to ensure a connection between the east and west sides of the community.

Roger Shanks of the Dahlin Group explained that the participants in the Vision Studio were asked to select photo preferences for three different areas of the plan. He reported that the participants in the Vision Studio recommended sidewalk cafes as their #1 item for the core area. Other high priority

uses for the Core area included outdoors seating, restaurants, and mixed uses (with residential above retail). He indicated that the uses and features that were supported for neighborhoods were “tree-lined streets”, schools and local retail services. Roger reported that the uses that were a high priority for the Greenbelt area included: walking trails, bike paths, orchards, small rural residences, wholesale nurseries and residential vineyards.

Sal Yakubu explained that participants in the Design Studio worked with blocks (representing different building typologies) to design concepts for three areas of the plan (the core area, a transit-oriented neighborhood, and a transit-oriented workplace). He indicated that the main preferences for the core are included: higher density development, preservation of view sheds to the west and a powerful “gateway entrance statement”. He stated that their preference for the transit-oriented neighborhoods included compatibility with existing neighborhoods, preservation of the existing skyline, architectural variety and walk-ability. Sal stated that the major preferences for the transit-oriented workplace included maximizing development with convenient parking structures and pedestrian orientation and retail district connections.

Eileen asked the Task Force to confirm and comment on: 1) the armature of the three alternative design concepts (the environmental footprint and the transit and parkways systems), 2) the land use assumptions and 3) the Greenbelt strategies.

1) Armature:

Eileen explained that the community generally supported the lake as a focal point, the realignment of Fisher Creek, the transit loop and spine concepts, and the concept of a parkways system. She indicated that they also recommend a multi-model transit hub near the town center.

The Task Force made the following comments:

- Concern about the cost of implementing the Specific Plan and questions as to what the budget was. *(Laurel indicated that cost is one of the important screening tests for which the three concepts will be analyzed to ensure that the Plan is realistic and affordable.)*
- Comments that staff and the consultants had done an excellent job with the Saturday workshop and the development of the three alternative design concepts.
- Support for enhancement of Fisher Creek, the lake as a major focal point for the core area and a combined light rail and fixed transit system for Coyote Valley.
- Mixed support for both Alternatives 2 and 3.
- Concern about phasing and concern that the Plan needs to be realistic.
- Question as to how the area near Laguna Seca will be treated in the plan.
- Concern that every element of the Plan be integrated (including circulation, the transit and parkway system and parks and open space and schools).
- Concern about integrity of the open space area located between the realigned Fisher Creek and the westerly foothills if development is planned for that area.
- Concern that the areas in the southeast of the Plan area were not adequately served by transit

and circulation systems.

- Recommendation to retain more water in the Greenbelt area if possible.
- Recommendation for as much open space as possible around the enhanced Fisher Creek corridor.
- Recommendation for senior centers in proximity to transit (no more than 800 feet from transit).
- Recommendation for a shuttle bus from the core area to outlying areas.
- Recommendation that there be more time for discussion among the Task Force members regarding the three alternative concepts.
- Question as to who will be using the parkway.
- Concern that there will be a lot of people using the connection from McKean Road in the Almaden Valley area as a convenient route to areas to the south (Morgan Hill, Gilroy and San Benito).
- Support for the concept of a lake as the focal point of the core area.
- Support for the realignment and enhancement of Fisher Creek.
- Support for a transit system that connects to the CalTrain station and provides a hub for transit.
- Support for transit extending further south to Gilroy and Morgan Hill.
- Support for the parkway system.
- Recommendation that the traffic analysis include a discussion of how much through traffic there should be in Coyote Valley.
- Concern that all uses should be within easy walking radius to all other areas and that there be adequate bikeways within the Plan.

2) Land Use Assumptions:

Eileen indicated that the community recommended that higher density uses be located in the town center and near transit, supported preservation of views of the foothills, supported a gateway effect with varied building heights along Bailey Avenue for the Highway 101 interchange, recommended multi-use of parking structures, recommended retail uses and focal points in the neighborhoods and varied architecture so that the plan does not look like one big "project".

The Task Force made the following comments:

- Recommendation that higher density development be as close to transit as possible.
- Recommendation to focus the density in the core area and provide walk-able neighborhoods with their own centers with services (e.g. shops, banking and laundry facilities), schools, parks and adult education facilities.
- Concern that schools were not included in the building block typologies at the Design Studio at the workshop.
- Recommendation that schools be planned in close proximity to neighborhoods with safe

access so children do not have to cross busy streets.

- Concern for preserving the beauty of Coyote Valley, which is “similar to some areas in northern and central Italy”.
- Recommendation that the transit system should be adjacent or connected to CalTrain station with a central transit hub.
- Recommendation that residential density not be placed near the CalTrain tracks since that is not a desirable place to live.
- Recommendation that there be a mixture of higher densities in the core area as well as in the outlying neighborhoods with good bus service.
- Concern that all of the density would be in the core and the rest suburban.

3) Greenbelt:

Eileen indicated that the community recommended a variety of uses in the Greenbelt including: bike paths, pedestrian and equestrian trails, orchards, vineyards, lakes, picnic areas, wildlife crossings, estate homes and smaller rural residences, co-op farms, greenhouses, specialty farms, and equestrian activities.

Laurel explained that staff and the consultant’s team had heard a wide variety of community comments regarding the Greenbelt that fall into three categories including:

- Recommendation for the retention of agricultural uses.
- Recommendation to create value for the property owners in the Greenbelt.
- Questions as to whether there would be the potential for subdivision.

She recommended that several options be explored over the summer including:

- Continue to look at pursuing open space easements and work with the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority.
- Review of the potential for transfer of development right and clustering, and
- Respect for existing development patterns and explore the implications of considering some additional subdivisions.

The Task Force made the following comments:

- Recommendation to pursue strategies for open space easements and to work with the Open Space Authority and others on creative ideas for preservation of open space in the Greenbelt.
- Recommendation to consider a mitigation policy that would allow the Open Space Authority to accept lands outside of the study area as possible open space easements (e.g. areas near Cinnabar in the foothills)
- Recommendation to explore as many options as possible to create an open space buffer in the Greenbelt.

5. Discussion of Screening Criteria (“Filtering”):

Eileen indicated that the community recommended the following criteria be added to the screening and filtering criteria: traffic impacts within the entire region, maintenance of a healthy lifestyle, maintenance of the community that exists in Coyote Valley now, equal spread of the costs and burdens in the Specific Plan, and assessment of the benefits to the San Jose region as a whole.

The Task Force recommended that the following additional criteria: ecological sustainability, environmental efficiency, economic feasibility, phasing and implementation for financing and walk-ability.

Laurel explained the next steps in the planning process and indicated that staff and the consultant team would be taking the ideas from the community and the Task Force and factoring them into the three design alternatives as appropriate. She explained that the three alternatives would be tested against all of the screening criteria over the summer. Laurel indicated that the alternatives would also be evaluated and tested by several technical consultants and the economic consultants, City departments and local and regional agencies against the same screening criteria. She explained that the consultant team would present a technical evaluation of each of the three alternative concepts and make a recommendation of the elements of a preferred design concept at the Task Force and Community Meeting on August 14, 2004.

6. Public Comments:

- Dennis Kennedy, representing City of Morgan Hill, submitted written comments from the City of Morgan Hill identifying their major issues with the CVSP. The issues are potential traffic impacts to south County, the provision of adequate and affordable housing for new jobs created in Coyote Valley, coordination of transportation planning and transit issues and required mitigation with all south county cities, reservation of adequate school sites and financing for required schools to serve new Coyote Valley residents (see attached written comments).
- Richard De Smit, resident and property owner, stated that his family has owned land in the Coyote area since 1917, and that he felt that the Greenbelt property owners are not being treated fairly in this process. He indicated that they are being left out and no value is being created for the lands in the Greenbelt. He stated that 51% of the land in the planning area is in the Greenbelt but there are no Greenbelt property owners on the Task Force, and that additional meetings with the Greenbelt owners are needed.
- Rich DeLa Rosa asked what the timeline is for the Plan.

- Laurie Williams, who lives in Las Paseos in District 2, recommended that the land planning consultants visit her development that was established in 1968 with a small self-contained village concept (with pathways leading from cul-de-sac to schools, shopping, parks and walkways).

7. Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at about 7:35 p.m. The next Task Force and Community Workshop is scheduled for Saturday, August 14, 2004.

\\Pbce005\CoyoteValley_SpecificPlan\CVSP Mtgs_TASKFORCE\Meeting Summary\TFNo. 20\Task Force_Meeting#20_6.14 Task Force Meeting.doc